

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/541,051	06/29/2005	Philip Steven Newton	NL 021482	4083	
24737 PHILIPS INT	7590 07/01/200 ELLECTUAL PROPER	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001			NEWLIN, TIMOTHY R		
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2424		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/01/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/541,051	NEWTON ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Timothy R. Newlin	2424		

	Timothy R. Newlin	2424					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 12 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>Since reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance, (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavitial (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropriat	a extension fee				
Detersions of time in gray be doublest of without 57 of the 1704(s), in the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CPR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (5) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the notice of Appeal has been filed.	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS	·						
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a They raise new issues that would require further core b They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed).	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
(c) M They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	it canceling the				
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</li> </ol>		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
/Christopher Kelley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2424							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment seems to emphasize that the method relates specifically to storage rather than playback. However, the added language would not distinguish over OPENTV as stated on page 2 of the final rejection, which cites p. 5, II. 26-27 of OPENTV to meet the storage component. The amendment also adds the word "alternatively" to the last limitation. The alternative nature of the categories is implicit even without the recital of "alternatively," by virtue of the "or" stucture of the last limitation. The proposed addition of "alternatively" does not substantively change the scope of the claim and is therefore not entered.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The request for reconsideration (dated 6/12/2009) merely repeats the arguments made by the applicant in the previous response (dated 1/12/2009). Those arguments were found unpersuasive (See final rejection dated 4/23/20090, pp. 2-3), and remain so. Therefore the arguments in the after final response do not place the application in better condition for allowance.